

And so we are a Nation at risk. A Nation that is not as well prepared as it should be, and as it really must be.

Mr. INSLEE. Well, I would agree with you. You have to ask, why has this happened? And I think it comes from an attitude of unbridled rose-colored glasses and feel-good politics. The administration wanted to have a war we could all just kind of feel good about, not have any personal sacrifice associated with it, not have any concern on our tax policy about that whatsoever.

It was feel-good politics, and the attitude is that we try to all feel good over here, and the only people who would be suffering are the men and women in Iraq. That is a wholly irresponsible way to fight a war, and that is what has gone on.

I wonder if I can address a little different issue of our Real Security plan, and that is what I like about the aggressiveness of the Democratic Real Security plan, because as you know, you have been a leader on this, we Democrats feel we need to be aggressive in disarming our enemy.

The most effective effort is offensive. And we want to be offensive, not meaning disliked, but offensive in being aggressive and assertive to disarm our enemies. And I want to mention two ways, one short and one not so short.

The short way we want to disarm our enemies, we want to make sure that they cannot get access to fissionable materials, which frankly are as loose and insecure tonight as we speak; it is roaming around places around middle Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union, which is still secured with maybe a bicycle lock. I pay more attention to my Chinelli bicycle than some of these old failed States in the middle part of Europe to fissionable material.

And we need to secure that. And as numerous reports have indicated, the executive branch of this government has failed to secure the number one threat to this country, which is that fissionable material. And we will get that job done. We will make the investment it takes to do that, because that has got to be an extremely high priority for this country.

So one way you disarm your opponent is you take away their fissionable material that is laying around all over the world right now. And we will get that job done.

But the second thing is even bigger. We need to disarm our enemy from their financial resources to attack us, and that means that we have got to be energy independent and stop sending our dollars to the Middle East. We have got to start sending them to Middle Western farmers rather than Middle Eastern sheiks, in this regard.

Because of that \$3-plus, one of my staffers paid \$3.35 this morning, that \$3.35 gallon, a good part of that goes to the CEO of Exxon, who just walked away with \$400 million in a bonus package, and the rest, a lot, goes to the Middle East to arm our enemies.

And we know that many of those regimes have been playing footsie with al Qaeda and various other groups. We know that our money we are spending is going to arm our enemies, and so we believe what we need in this country is an energy independence program that is not just rhetorical, but is real. And I was pleased to have the President give us some rhetoric during his State of the Union speech.

□ 2030

He said, we have an addiction to oil. Well, welcome to the land of recognition, Mr. President. We have been waiting 6 years, but, nevertheless, it is good to hear the rhetoric. But the problem is we are not seeing the reality.

The week he talked about breaking our addiction to oil, he fired 100 scientists at our renewable lab in Boulder, Colorado. When the press suggested that seemed somewhat inconsistent, those pink slips were pulled back, and those scientists were back on the job.

But we think we need something as bold as John F. Kennedy about in the 1960s, we need an Apollo project, we are going to go the moon, we will invest in the capital and wisdom and technical brilliance in this country. We are going to take a big step forward, one big step for man, one giant leap for mankind.

We need now a giant leap in energy policy in this country to depend on the technical prowess of this country, because Kennedy knew, and he stood right behind you right there. We are in an historic place here. He stood there March 9, 1961, and he said, we are going to go to the Moon. That was an amazing point. Our rockets were blowing up on the launch pad. We had launched a little softball into orbit. We hadn't even invented Tang yet.

A lot of people thought that was an absurdly ambitious goal, but he understood a central tenet of the American character is that when challenged, we respond, number one. Number two, we are the greatest tinkers since, you know, whoever in Space 2001 invented the bone as a weapon. We are the people that can invent our way out of this.

We need to make the investments to do that. If you look at what the President has done in his budget, it is a pathetically insufficient commitment to this goal. We got so far two words from the President. We got energy independence.

We got two words, but we have no funds to do the job from him, no bold strategic challenge, no commitment to science, no commitment in our academic institutions. You look at the money, he came out, and I was listening carefully to the State of the Union address. He had this bold rhetoric and he said, therefore, I am committing a few million dollars to this project. He has committed to this budget for biofuels less than we spend in Iraq in about 18 hours. That is what we have committed to this project.

We have men over there fighting a war now for 3-plus years at about \$80

billion a year, and he is committing less than 18 hours of what we are spending in Iraq to try to disarm our enemies. That is not a wise strategy. We need a significant energy plan to solve this problem.

We have it in the new Apollo energy project, H.R. 2828, that I have introduced and others. That is a bold step, leap for mankind that we will get this job done. So I am happy that the Democrats have embraced real policies and not just rhetoric.

Mr. SCHIFF. I have to take my hat off to my colleague from Washington, because no one has led more consistently and more strongly on this issue than you have.

Before our caucus had a strategy jointly that we have put forward before the President came forward, JAY INSLEE was there, and you have been just the most powerful advocate for years for an Apollo-like project to bring about energy independence.

Let me touch on the first point you made, and then I want to go a little bit more into energy independence and talk about some of the other pillars, and then get to the pillar we are going to focus on this evening.

You mentioned that the priority has to be placed on securing this nuclear material in the former Soviet Union. I agree with you exactly. When you look at what is preventing al Qaeda from detonating a nuclear weapon on our soil, you might look at the difficulty of getting the material in the country.

Well, that is not very difficult. Unfortunately, as we have discussed, we don't have the portal technology engaged to the degree that we need it, and how would you get a nuclear weapon in the country? Well, I like to quote the chancellor of UCLA, Chancellor Carnesale, who says, well, you could smuggle it in a bail of marijuana. That is one way you could get it in. That is sort of the magnitude of the problem of keeping it out. That is a tough strategy at the border.

Well, then, you might ask, what about the technology? Maybe it is tough to actually build the mechanics of the bomb. But that is not hard either. That is a 50-year-old technology. Cal Tech is in my district. I bet I could pick any two Cal Tech students and they could design a crude nuclear weapon for me using information on the Internet.

What is the obstacle? Is it the will of al Qaeda? It is not the will, as Osama bin Laden has talked very plainly about the imperative to bring about an American Hiroshima. I think those writings and those speeches he has given are basically his own Mein Kampf, and we ignore that at our own peril.

So if it is not lack of will or the lack of technological prowess or the lack of ability to get it into the country, the question is why hasn't al Qaeda brought this off? The answer is, it is hard to get the material. It is still hard to get the material. That is the only